



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

of courtly love in Italian literature, he fails to note where Chaucer in his versions of Boccaccio's poems, misses or misinterprets the philosophic subtleties of his original, borrowed or imitated from the predecessors and betters of the poet. Even where Chaucer has mitigated the harshness of Guido delle Colonne's general remarks on womankind in the *Historia Trojana* (224), he has been as ignorant as all his commentators of the fact that Guido was only adopting both the thought and language of scholastics, who found a philosophic basis for the inferiority of women, and their love for men. Guido, a member of the early Italian school of poetry, adopted this view, the conclusions of which were avoided by the later poets of the *dolce stil novo*, by attributing angelic qualities to their mistresses. Mr. Dodd's book ends as it begins by the author showing that he did not take the trouble to inform himself upon the main subject of his book.

GEORGE L. HAMILTON.

Collectanea Biblica Latina, Vol. II. Codex Rehdigeranus
(Die vier Evangelien nach der lateinischen Handschrift
R 169 der Stadtbibliothek Breslau) herausgegeben von
HEINRICH JOSEPH VOGELS, Rom, F. Pustet, 1913.

Although the republishing of famous old books and manuscripts has long been known as the easiest way to get one's name upon the title page of a valuable book or article, no one would have ventured to bring this criticism against Vogels, even if it had not been guarded against by the defence in his preface. The original publication by H. F. Haase appeared in six programs of the University of Breslau, 1865-6; it contained no study of the manuscript, although one was promised; it never had a wide circulation and has long been unprocurable. A reprint and study of the manuscript was thus imperatively needed, but Vogels has given us far more. In spite of Haase's careful work over 200 errors, mostly slight, have been corrected, and in 100 more cases, where erasures had been unnoticed or dispaired of by Haase, the reading of the first hand has now been deciphered.

The introduction is divided into three sections: history of the manuscript; description of the manuscript; character of text. The manuscript seems to have been written in the second half of the seventh or the first half of the eighth century, but nothing is known of its wanderings before the middle of the fifteenth, when it appeared at Aquileia. The

MS once contained about 350 pages, but only 296 remain. The text of Mark and Luke is practically entire, but Matthew has lost the first chapter and a half, and John is quite fragmentary, having six lacunae and ending with 16, 13. Very interesting is the proof given on page xvi of the introduction that the MS was copied from the parent line for line and column for column. Ligatures, abbreviations, and peculiar spellings receive ample treatment.

An almost contemporary hand has corrected the MS in many hundred passages, in all cases substituting the Vulgate for the Old Latin reading. Though the erasing was very carefully done the original can usually be deciphered. A later hand (eighth century Italian) has added one half of a *Capitulare Evangelii*, or list of Gospel readings for the days of the Church year. A list of the many liturgical marks in the MS completes the chapter.

To illustrate the character of text Vogels first gives a selection of 18 readings of *l* which show combination of two Latin variants. All seem in point except perhaps the first:

Matth. 14, 8 *l*: *dixit da mihi inquit* (ebenso g² E O⁸¹ T Z* P)

dixit da mihi a b c d f (ff¹) ff² g¹ h k q D Q

inquit da mihi R

da mihi inquit vulgate (and Greek)

The reading of *l* and its Latin relatives is also found in Greek W, a fourth century MS, so the conflation is older and more widely distributed than suggested by Vogels. His contention nevertheless holds good that the text of *l* shows combination not only of Old Latin with Vulgate text, but of the various styles of Old Latin text with each other. As above noted the Vulgate readings have further been multiplied by the careful corrections of a second hand. This is most interesting as it gives us an example of the manner in which the many mixed text MSS were formed. Yet this process was even older in the text history of *l*, for Vogels' proof of the combined character of the first hand text of *l* shows that some ancestor had suffered a similar correction. It may further be noted that this earlier correction affected Matthew and Mark more than Luke and John and that not even the parts of the individual Gospels fared at all the same.

The Vulgate readings in the MS have no interest but the Old Latin remnants are good and old, showing in general a notable relationship to the Old Irish branch of the Latin tradition, as found in the Vulgate MSS DE Φ LQR. A table of 18 agreements with D in Mark illustrates this relationship. These are however all Old Latin readings and Vogels has found support in other OL MSS for all except one of these examples. He intentionally omits the Greek support, which in several cases is both good and old. Owing to the frag-

mentary character of Vulgate E the comparison with *l* is made in Luke, 7, 24-11, 1 and shows 22 interesting agreements. The agreement with PLQ and R is hardly less, though it is noteworthy that the entire group never seems to unite on any of the peculiar errors listed. From this and other evidence Vogels infers that the relationship of *l* to the Irish Vulgate MSS is not a direct one, but is presumably with the Old Latin element back of the Irish Vulgate.

Of the other Vulgate MSS only G (classed as g^1 in Mark, Luke, and John) shows noteworthy agreement. Of these some 30 examples are given from Mark, most of which show some support from the Irish MSS, and all have other Old Latin support. Very remarkable also is the agreement with M (27 examples) in chapters 12 and 13 of Luke.

Vogels finds the text of *l* in the main too composite to warrant extended comparison with the other Old Latin MSS or the attempt to classify its text as distinctly "European", "Italian", or "African". This varying character of text is well illustrated by printing selected passages in parallel columns with the Vulgate. In Matthew 13, 1-15, and Luke 1, 1-22, the agreement is almost perfect. In Luke 2, 41-52 there is still Vulgate influence, but the differences are more striking, while in Luke 23, 24-37, John 2, 1-12, and 4, 1-14, the text is almost pure Old Latin, and the agreement with the Old Latin *e* is very close in the more peculiar readings. Enough has perhaps been said to show that the basic text of *l* was old and good, but that it has suffered much correction.

The remaining 300 pages of the stately and well printed volume give an accurate line for line reprint of the manuscript. Only the first hand readings appear in the text; erased letters and words are enclosed in brackets, if legible; if not, they are shown by asterisks. Corrections by later hands are given in the footnotes. Three excellent facsimile pages complete the work.

The incomplete and sometimes inaccurate citation of the readings of *l* in Tischendorf's New Testament, which has been our best available source up to this time, makes this new edition of *l* indispensable to the textual student and all must be most grateful to Vogels for this complete and accurate publication.

HENRY A. SANDERS.